

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Kremmling Field Office  
P.O. Box 68  
Kremmling, CO 80459**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

NUMBER: CO-120-2008-53-EA

PROJECT NAME: Bonanza Flowline Work

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 9 N., R. 79 W., Sec. 2  
McCallum Oil Field, Jackson County

APPLICANT: Bonanza Creek Energy Operating CO., LLC

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background: The Federal mineral estate, administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as part of its mineral leasing program, provides minerals, including fossil fuels, for the benefit and use of the American public, and encourages development of domestic oil and gas reserves to reduce dependence on foreign energy supplies. Mineral development is supported by the Mineral Leasing Act (1920 30 USC 181 et. seq.) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA).

Bonanza Creek Energy Operating CO., LLC (Bonanza) owns a number of Oil and Gas Leases in the McCallum Oil Field (McCallum) in Jackson County, Colorado, an area addressed in the RMP with an *Oil and Gas* land use priority. The ROD states that these lands are known to contain oil and gas, and the priority is to given to leasing and development for the production of oil and gas.

Proposed Action: The Proposed Action would occur in the McCallum Oil Field in Jackson County. Bonanza proposes to reconfigure and replace flow lines as follows. The Proposed Action would take 3-5 days to complete, trenching equipment would include a trencher or backhoe, and trenching would follow existing roads and/or disturbance corridors of the original flowlines. See attached project maps.

**#44 Flowline:** Bonanza proposes to install new production line (2" SDR-7 fused poly line) between the #44 well and the S1 header building in order to convert #44 from an injector to a producer. Installation and replacement of this line would require construction of an 1130' trench, 5' deep by 2' wide.

**#82 Flowline:** Bonanza proposes to install new production line (2" SDR-7 fused poly line) between the #82 well and the S1 header building in order to convert #82 from an injector to a producer. Installation and replacement of this line would require construction of a 2130' trench, 5' deep by 2' wide.

**#91 Flowline:** Bonanza proposes to install new 2" SDR-7 fused poly line between the S1 and W1 header buildings. Installation and replacement of this line would require construction of a 1930' trench, 5' deep by 2' wide.

**#92 Flowline:** Bonanza proposes to install new production line (2" SDR-7 fused poly line) between the #92 well and the E1 header building. The current line is a steel line which has been repaired numerous times and is in need of replacement in order to prevent a release. Installation and replacement of this line would require construction of a 1050' trench, 5' deep by 2' wide.

**#144 Flowline:** Bonanza proposes to install new injection line (1" Sch 40, welded, coated steel line) from the #144 wellhead to the #44 well in order to convert #144 from producer to injection. Installation and replacement of this line would require construction of a 640' trench (410' of which would be held in common with the proposed trench line for the #82 well), 5' deep by 2' wide.

Design features of the Proposed Action:

- Bonanza would be responsible for the control of any invasive species within the project area, and for reclaiming the area with a BLM-approved seed mix (provided to the operator at the time of reclamation – Fall 2008).
- The approved seed mix would include native species, including sagebrush.
- The work would not be done during wet soil conditions.
- Original contours would be restored, but soil surfaces would be left rough, maximizing microtopography to help hold soil moisture, reduce runoff, and improve seeding success.
- Water bars or other methods (e.g. pitting) would be used to prevent runoff from travelling along flowlines on slopes greater than 5% that are greater than 10 feet in length.

- Seeding would be done on all areas of disturbance, during the late fall. If perennial ground cover is not equal to the surrounding vegetation by the third growing season, then the seeding would be redone.
- Rills or excessive erosion along the proposed flowlines would require additional reclamation work to stabilize the site as soon as possible, prior to additional storms or runoff.
- The operator would be required to immediately contact BLM KFO, remove all free oil, and coordinate with the BLM in cleanup and bioremediation operations.
- Bonanza would be required to contact Encana Oil and Gas and Rocky Mountain Natural Gas before proceeding with construction so as not to interfere with their buried pipelines.

No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative would be to deny Bonanza authorization to reconfigure and replace the proposed flowlines. Bonanza would not be able to manage their oil and gas wells/lease in a manner in which they've determined to be most productive.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION: The BLM is specifically responding to an application from Bonanza to replace the aforementioned flowlines. The proposed work would occur in the McCallum Oil Field in Jackson County, Colorado and within lease boundaries owned and operated by Bonanza.

There is a need to consider the Proposed Action because Bonanza would like to maximize production of their oil and gas leases, and reduce the likelihood of an emergency repair due to flowline failure and release.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Decision Language:

II. RESOURCE DECISIONS, 1. Minerals Management, PG 4. Notes that the objective is to maximize the availability of the federal mineral estate for mineral exploration and development.

The proposed action is located in an area addressed in the RMP with an *Oil and Gas* land use priority. The ROD states that these lands are known to contain oil and gas, and the priority is given to leasing and development for the production of oil and gas.

Standards for Public Land Health: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. The following are the approved standards:

Standard	Definition/Statement
#1 Upland Soils	Upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, land form, and geologic processes. Adequate soil infiltration and permeability allows for the accumulation of soil moisture necessary for optimal plant growth and vigor, and minimizes surface runoff.
#2 Riparian Systems	Riparian systems associated with both running and standing water, function properly and have the ability to recover from major surface disturbances such as fire, severe grazing, or 100-year floods. Riparian vegetation captures sediment, and provides forage, habitat and bio-diversity. Water quality is improved or maintained. Stable soils store and release water slowly.
#3 Plant and Animal Communities	Healthy, productive plant and animal communities of native and other desirable species are maintained at viable population levels commensurate with the species and habitat's potential. Plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations, and ecological processes.
#4 Threatened and Endangered Species	Special status, threatened and endangered species (federal and state), and other plants and animals officially designated by the BLM, and their habitats are maintained or enhanced by sustaining healthy, native plant and animal communities.
#5 Water Quality	The water quality of all water bodies, including ground water where applicable, located on or influenced by BLM lands will achieve or exceed the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado. Water Quality Standards for surface and ground waters include the designated beneficial uses, numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and anti-degradation requirements set forth under State law as found in (5 CCR 1002-8), as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act.

Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in the environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements below or in the Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Review Record and Checklist (IDT-RRC) (Appendix 1).

## AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

**CRITICAL ELEMENTS:** The following critical elements: Air Quality, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Cultural Resources, Environmental Justice, Farmlands- Prime and Unique, Floodplains, Invasive/non-native species, Native American Religious Concerns, Wastes, Hazardous or Solid, Wetlands and Riparian Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wilderness were evaluated and determined that they were not present or that there would be no impact to them from the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative. See IDT-RRC in Appendix 1 for further information.

The following critical elements were determined to be potentially impacted and were carried forward for analysis from the IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

### **MIGRATORY BIRDS**

**Affected Environment:** The proposed well sites would be located in a sagebrush habitat type. Migratory birds expected to inhabit the project sites include sage-sparrows, Northern Harriers, Burrowing owls, short-eared owls, Swainson's hawks, and golden eagles.

**Environmental Consequences:** The proposed project would eliminate a small amount of sagebrush habitat, however, no take of migratory species or active nests would be expected to occur as a result of the project. Reclamation, which would be implemented after project completion, would adequately restore most of the sagebrush habitat lost to the construction activities associated with the proposed project. Accordingly, the Proposed Action would not have any major direct, indirect or cumulative impacts on migratory birds. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to migratory birds in the project area.

### **THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)**

**Affected Environment:** A list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species which could inhabit the proposed project area was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) March 31, 2008. Analysis of this list indicated that no listed species would be impacted by the proposed project.

The proposed project is located in habitat occupied by Greater sage-grouse, a BLM designated sensitive species. While sage-grouse occupy the project area on a yearlong basis, the area is especially important as winter and breeding habitat for sage-grouse. The sagebrush habitat adjoining the project area provides hiding and nesting cover for sage-grouse during the breeding season. Three leks (breeding sites) are located within 4 miles of project area with the closest lek at 1.2 miles to the south.

**Environmental Consequences:** Since little vegetative loss from the proposed project is anticipated, a small amount of sage-grouse nesting habitat would be impacted. Most of this habitat would be restored when the flowlines are successfully reclaimed with native vegetation. The distance the flowlines are to the closest lek, located 1.2 miles to the south, should be

sufficient to avoid conflicts with breeding sage-grouse and construction activities. Since the project disturbance would not occur during the March 15 to June 1 period, there would be minimal impacts to sage grouse. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to sage grouse in the project area.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: In 2000, allotment # 07031 was assessed for standards. It was determined that the allotment was meeting the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado. Neither the Proposed Action nor the No Action Alternative would prevent this allotment from meeting Standard 4.

#### WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: The McCallum Oil Field is located within the Upper North Platte River Basin, with most of the Proposed Action occurring in the Michigan River 5<sup>th</sup> order watershed. Flowlines #91 and #92 extend into the Canadian River 5<sup>th</sup> order watershed, but only for a short distance and on flat slopes. Most of the proposed disturbance would be tributary to Lee Draw, an intermittent drainage tributary to the Michigan River. Neither Lee Draw nor the Michigan River has been identified as having water quality concerns. The wetland portions of the draw are downstream from the proposed disturbance, with the upper portion of the draw being ephemeral.

Environmental Consequences: The Proposed Action occurs in areas that have been previously disturbed and have the potential for future disturbance. The amount of disturbance on a landscape scale is fairly small, but under Colorado law, the operator is responsible to consider the amount of surface disturbance that is going on in the entire field and not just these flowlines. If the disturbances meet or exceed 1 acre, then the action falls under the Stormwater Rule and a stormwater permit must be obtained. By following best management practices required in the design features of the Proposed Action, runoff from the disturbed areas would be reduced and sediment loads would not impact surface water quality. Upgrading the existing flowlines would help protect shallow ground water and surface water quality in the future by reducing uncontrolled spills. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to water quality in the project area.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: The area is considered to be meeting Standard 5 for water quality. The Proposed Action, with design features, would help protect water quality in the area.

#### WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: Some potentially hazardous materials would be used during construction. In addition, solid waste would be generated during these proposed activities.

According to 29 CFR 1910.1200(g), the oil and gas operator is to maintain a file containing Material Safety Sheets (MSDS) for all chemicals, compounds, and/or substances which are utilized during the course of construction, drilling, completion, and production operations of this project. This file is to be available at all times employees are present at the site. Flammable or

combustible motor fuels would be present. Human solid and liquid wastes would be generated during the construction phase of the project.

Environmental Consequences: There would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts from the Proposed Action. However, this is dependent upon responsible use of hazardous materials and immediate containment and adequate cleanup in the event of a release. Consequences would be dependent on the volume and nature of the material released. In most situations involving hazardous materials, there are ways to remediate the area that has been contaminated. The operator is required to immediately contact BLM KFO, remove all free oil, and coordinate with the BLM in cleanup and bioremediation operations.

**NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS:** The following non-critical elements were determined to be potentially impacted and were carried forward for analysis from the IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

**SOILS** (includes a finding on Standard 1)

**Affected Environment:** The McCallum Oil Field is an old field with numerous disturbances, all in various stages or conditions of reclamation. The proposed work is located near the headquarters offices and near the major access roads that have been repeatedly disturbed. Soils are mapped in the Jackson County Soil Survey (NRCS, 1981), and are primarily sandy loam soils within Dry Mountain Loam or Valley Bench range sites. Flowlines #44, #82, and #144 all cross some slopes, although none of them greater than 30%. Flowlines #91 and #92 are located on fairly flat benches.

**Environmental Consequences:** Due to the short growing season, harsh exposure, and limited precipitation, surface reclamation can be difficult. By replacing older lines on #91 and #92, there would be the potential to prevent repeated disturbance in the future. Converting the other wells from injection to production is market dependant, and could be reversed in the future. Aligning the flowlines along access roads can help centralize areas of repeated or heavy disturbance, and reduce overall soil impacts. The design features of the Proposed Action would help minimize erosion concerns and improve reclamation success. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to soils in the project area.

**Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils:** Soil health is assessed on a landscape scale, and the grazing allotment which contains these flowlines was found to be meeting this standard. Minimizing soil disturbances and establishing good vegetative cover is important to maintaining long term soil health.

**VEGETATION** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

**Affected Environment:** The Proposed Action would occur in an existing oil and gas field with previous vegetative disturbance. The project area vegetation includes a mix of sagebrush with an understory of grasses and forbs.

**Environmental Consequences:** Under the Proposed Action, flow lines for the oil and gas field would be replaced using a trencher or backhoe which would cause the disturbance of native and seeded vegetation. However, these impacts would be minimized by the design features of the Proposed Action. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to vegetation in the project area.

**Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial):** In 2000, allotment # 07031 was assessed for standards. It was determined that the allotment was meeting the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado.



## WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

**Affected Environment:** The proposed flowlines would be constructed in sagebrush habitat which is occupied by a variety of birds and mammals. The project area is inhabited by mule deer and Rocky Mountain elk during winter. Pronghorn and small mammals including badgers, coyotes, and a variety of small rodents inhabit the area on a yearlong basis.

**Environmental Consequences:** The proposed project would have minor impacts to terrestrial wildlife, since habitat disturbance would be minimal. All vegetative disturbances associated with the project would be reclaimed. Harassment or disturbance of wildlife would also be minimal since construction activities would be short-term, in isolated areas, and not likely to occur during periods of animal concentration. The Proposed Action would not result in any major direct, indirect or cumulative impacts to the area's terrestrial wildlife. Under the No Action, there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to wildlife in the project area.

**Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic):** In 2000, allotment # 07031 was assessed for standards. It was determined that the allotment was meeting the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado. Neither the Proposed Action nor the No Action Alternative would prevent this allotment from meeting Standard 3.

## PALEONTOLOGY:

**Affected Environment:** The Area of Potential Effect (APE) was inventoried by pedestrian transects for fossil resources. The underlying surface geology is mapped as residuum on Pierre Shale and older gravel bearing terrace alluvium of Pleistocene age. Both of these formations have the potential to contain significant fossil resources.

**Environmental Consequences:** Inventory did not locate any fossil materials. However, bedrock formations are said to be 20-40 inches below the present surface of loose, decomposing residuum. The KFO staff archaeologist/paleontologist would monitor the flow lines post-construction to observe and document any fossil materials that may have become exposed during trenching and flow line construction.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:** All resource values have been evaluated for cumulative impacts. Since the project area has already been previously disturbed, and the disturbance would be rehabilitated, there would be no cumulative impacts.

**PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:** The proposed project was listed on the Kremmling Field Office internet NEPA register and public room NEPA board.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:** See IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

# FONSI

## CO-120-2008-53-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

### DECISION RECORD

DECISION: It is my decision to authorize the Proposed Action as described in the attached EA. This decision is contingent on meeting all mitigation measures and monitoring requirements listed below.

RATIONALE: The Proposed Action will allow Bonanza to maximize the production of their oil and gas leases and reduce the likelihood of an emergency repair due to flowline failure and release.

MITIGATION MEASURES: See Attachment #1 and Design Features of the Proposed Action.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING:

- The KFO staff archeologist/paleontologist will complete a post-construction follow up inventory of the excavated and back filled flow line trenches to observe, document and evaluate any fossil materials that may have become exposed during trenching and flow line construction.

NAME OF PREPARER: Kelly Hodgson

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 7/18/08

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: /s/ Peter McFadden (acting)

DATE SIGNED: 7/18/08

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Standard Cultural and Paleontological Stipulations
- 2). Project maps

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Review Record and Checklist

## Attachment #1

### Standard Cultural & Paleontological stipulations:

The holder shall immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any and all antiquities, or other objects of historic, paleontological, or scientific interest including but not limited to, historic or prehistoric ruins or artifacts DISCOVERED as a result of operations under this authorization (16 U.S.C. 470.-3, 36 CFR 800.112). The holder shall immediately suspend all activities in the area of the object and shall leave such discoveries intact until written approval to proceed is obtained from the Authorized Officer. Approval to proceed will be based upon evaluation of the object(s). Evaluation shall be by a qualified professional selected by the Authorized Officer from a Federal agency insofar as practicable (BLM Manual 8142.06E). When not practicable, the holder shall bear the cost of the services of a non-Federal professional.

Within five working days the Authorized Officer will inform the holder as to:

- Whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- The mitigation measures the holder will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary); and,
- A timeframe for the Authorized Officer to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800.11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the Authorized Officer are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the holder wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the Authorized Officer will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the holder will be responsible for mitigation costs. The Authorized Officer will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the Authorized Officer that the required mitigation has been completed, the holder will then be allowed to resume construction.

Antiquities, historic, prehistoric ruins, paleontological or objects of scientific interest that are outside of the authorization boundaries but directly associated with the impacted resource will also be included in this evaluation and/or mitigation.

Antiquities, historic, prehistoric ruins, paleontological or objects of scientific interest, identified or unidentified, that are outside of the authorization and not associated with the resource within the authorization will also be protected. Impacts that occur to such resources, which are related to the authorizations activities, will be mitigated at the holder's cost.

Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g), the holder of this authorization must notify the Authorized Officer, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4 (c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the Authorized Officer

## Appendix #1

### INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS REVIEW RECORD AND CHECKLIST:

**Project Title: Bonanza Flowline Work**

**Project Leader: Kelly Hodgson**

#### **Consultation/Permit Requirements:**

Consultation	Date Initiated	Date Completed	Responsible Specialist/ Contractor	Comments
Cultural/Archeological Clearance/SHPO		7/15/08	BBW	See below.
Native American	7/2/08		BBW	To date, no Native American Tribe has identified any area of traditional concern.
T&E Species/FWS	N/A	N/A	MM	See analysis in EA.
Permits Needed (i.e. Air or Water)			Bonaza, if needed	The state requires stormwater permits for Oil & Gas disturbances on a lease or field scale. If Bonaza's disturbances for the flowline work and other construction or surface disturbing work meets 1 acre, they are responsible for a stormwater permit.

**(NP) = Not Present**

**(NI) = Resource/Use Present but Not Impacted**

**(PI) = Potentially Impacted and Brought Forward for Analysis.**

NP NI PI	Discipline/Name	Date Review Comp.	Initials	Review Comments (required for Critical Element NIs, and for elements that require a finding but are not carried forward for analysis.)
<b>CRITICAL ELEMENTS</b>				
NI	Air Quality <b>Belcher</b>	7/14/08	PB	Air quality would not be impacted by the Proposed Action.
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern <b>J. Stout</b>	7/18/08	JS	There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NI	Cultural Resources <b>Wyatt</b>	7/15/08	BBW	A cultural resource Class I inventory (Report #CR-08-36) was conducted for the undertaking based on previous Class III inventory. The inventory was done for two separate flowlines for a total of linear feet of 6,610 feet (2.28 acres). As a result, no historic properties would be affected.
NP	Environmental Justice <b>J. Stout</b>	7/18/08	JS	According to the most recent Census Bureau statistics (2000), there are no minority or low income communities within the Kremmling Planning Area.
NP	Farmlands, Prime and Unique <b>Belcher</b>	7/14/08	PB	There are no farmlands, prime or unique, in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NP	Floodplains <b>Belcher</b>	7/14/08	PB	The oil field is outside of a floodplain and would not affect any floodplain.

NP	Invasive, Non-native Species	<b>Scott</b>	7/7/08	MS	The proposed project area has no known infestations of invasive or non-native species. The design features of the Proposed Action would minimize any impacts.
PI	Migratory Birds	<b>McGuire</b>	7/17/18	MM	See analysis in EA.
NI	Native American Religious Concerns	<b>Wyatt</b>	7/18/08	BBW	To date, no Native American Tribe has identified any area of traditional concern.
PI	T/E, and Sensitive Species (Finding on Standard 4)	<b>McGuire</b>	7/17/18	MM	See analysis in EA.
PI	Wastes, Hazardous and Solid	<b>Hodgson</b>	7/11/08	KH	See analysis in EA.
PI	Water Quality, Surface and Ground (Finding on Standard 5)	<b>Belcher</b>	7/18/08	PB	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wetlands & Riparian Zones (Finding on Standard 2)	<b>Belcher</b>	7/18/08	PB	Finding: The flowline work is located upstream of any wetland area and would not impact any wetland area.
NP	Wild and Scenic Rivers	<b>Sterin</b>	7/16/08	BGS	There are no eligible Wild and Scenic River segments in the proposed project area.
NP	Wilderness	<b>Sterin</b>	7/16/08	BGS	There is no designated Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas in the proximity of the proposed project area.
<b>NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS</b> (A finding must be made for these elements)					
PI	Soils (Finding on Standard 1)	<b>Belcher</b>	7/18/08	PB	See analysis in EA.
PI	Vegetation (Finding on Standard 3)	<b>Torma</b>	6/30/08	PT	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wildlife, Aquatic (Finding on Standard 3)	<b>McGuire</b>	7/17/08	MM	No aquatic wildlife present in the project area.
PI	Wildlife, Terrestrial (Finding on Standard 3)	<b>McGuire</b>	7/17/08	MM	See analysis in EA.
<b>OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS</b>					
NI	Access/Transportation	<b>Monkouski</b>	7/18/08	JM	There would be no impacts.
	Fire	<b>Wyatt</b>	7/15/08	BBW	There would be no impacts.
NP	Forest Management	<b>Belcher</b>	7/18/08	KB	No forest resources present.
NI	Geology and Minerals	<b>Hodgson</b>	7/11/08	KH	No impacts.
NI	Hydrology/Water Rights	<b>Belcher</b>	7/18/08	PB	Hydrology concerns are in Soils and Water Quality sections. There would be no impacts to water rights.
PI	Paleontology	<b>Rupp</b>	7/16/08	FGR	See analysis in EA.
NI	Noise	<b>Monkouski</b>	7/18/08	JM	There would be minimal impacts from construction activities.
NI	Range Management	<b>Torma</b>	6/30/08	PT	There is livestock grazing in the proposed area that would not be affected by the proposed action.
NI	Lands/ Realty Authorizations	<b>Cassel</b>	6/25/08	SC	There are no leases or permits in the proposed project location. There are three ROW's in this location. One is the BLM Auto Tour which should not be affected. There are two buried natural gas pipelines COC 0 18989 issued to Rocky Mountain Natural Gas Co. and COC 0 16049 issued to Encana Oil and Gas (USA) Inc. It is the responsibility of Bonanza to contact both companies so as not to interfere with their buried pipelines.
NI	Recreation	<b>Monkouski</b>	7/18/08	JM	There would be no impacts to recreation

	<b>Sterin Windsor</b>			activities.
NI	Socio-Economics <b>J. Stout</b>	7/18/08	JS	There would be no impacts.
NI	Visual Resources <b>Hodgson</b>	7/11/08	KH	No impacts.
NI	Cumulative Impact Summary <b>J. Stout</b>	7/18/08	JS	There would be no impacts.
<b>FINAL REVIEW</b>				
	P&E Coordinator <b>J. Stout</b>	7/18/08	JS	
	Field Manager <b>D. Stout</b>			